DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 039 IR 009 859

AUTHOR Rader, Hannelore B., Ed.
TITLE Collection Development Strategies for Academic and Research Libraries.
INSTITUTION Michigan Library Association, Lansing.
PUB DATE 13 Nov 79
NOTE 62p.: Papers presented at a workshop sponsored by the Michigan Library Association, Michigan ACRL Chapter, and University of Michigan School of Library Science (Ann Arbor, MI, November 13, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries: *Budgeting: Case Studies: *College Faculty: *Communication (Thought Transfer): *Library Acquisition: Position Papers: Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS Michigan

ABSTRACT

This collection of six papers and comments from a workshop focuses on three aspects of collection development--budget implications, communication with faculty, and written policies. Points of view are expressed by speakers from small- and medium-sized academic, private, and public libraries in Michigan. The first paper discusses the implication of knowledge explosion, information obsolescence, inflation, dwindling resources, and technology on collection development. Budgeting for library collection development at Central Michigan University is explained in this paper and for Kalamazoo College Library in the second paper. The next two papers, presented by librarians from Hope College and Washtenaw Community College, both address problems in and strategies for communicating with faculty on collection development. Written collection development policies are discussed by librarians from Tannahill Research Library (the museum library of Greenfield Village and the Henry Ford Museum) and the University of Michigan-Dearborn. Comments on the content of the presentations by the library director at Earlham College conclude the workshop proceedings. References are listed for each paper as well as further readings on collection development. (RBF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210039

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES for ACADEMIC and RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Papers presented at a workshop on Collection Development sponsored by the Michigan Library Association, Michigan ACRL Chapter and the University of Michigan School of Library Science at Ann Arbor, Michigan.
November 13, 1979

Edited by Hannelore B. Rader
Director, Library/Learning Center
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Published by the Michigan Library Association, 1980

IR009859

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hannelore B. Rader
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

On November 13, 1979 the University of Michigan School of Library Science, the Michigan Library Association and the Michigan ACRL Chapter sponsored a workshop on "Collection Development Strategies for Academic and Research Libraries" in Ann Arbor. The workshop focused on three aspects of collection development--Budget Implications, Communication with Faculty and Written Policies.

"Budget Implications" was addressed by two Michigan academic librarians. Ronald G. Leach who was Associate Director of the Central Michigan University Library and has since become Dean of the Library of Indiana State University, in Terre Haute discussed "Budget Implications for Collection Development for Academic and Research Libraries" from the point of view of a medium size state-supported university. Eleanor H. Pinkham, College Librarian of Kalamazoo College, a small private college, presented her perceptions on "Budget Allocation and Collection Development."

After these two papers Evan Farber, Library Director at Earlham College, past President of ACRL and special guest at this workshop gave his reaction to the content of the presentations and on the topic of collection development in general.

The next part of the workshop concentrated on "Communication with Faculty" in the area of Collection Development and featured two more Michigan academic librarians. Carol Juth-Gavasso, Reference Research Librarian of Hope College, a small private college, spoke on "Collection Building: Communication Issues for Librarians and Faculty." Adella B.

Scott, Coordinator of the Public Services Area at the Washtenaw Community College Library Learning Center, a public, two-year college, discussed "Collection Development: Involvement with Faculty Through Curriculum Development." Again Mr. Farber gave a short reaction to the papers.

The last part of the workshop dealt with "Written Policies of Collection Development" and was addressed by two Michigan librarians. Joan W. Gartland, Librarian at the Tannahill Research Library, the museum library of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum, a special library, discussed "Writing the Collection Development Policy at the Tannahill Research Library." Shirley M. Smith, Associate Director of the University of Michigan-Dearborn Library, a small, public university library, spoke on "Written Policies for Collection Development."

Mr. Farber's comments are presented in summarized format at the conclusion of the papers.

To introduce the topic of collection development I would like to point out the possibility that budget constraints at present and in the forseeable future may in reality be a blessing in disguise for us in academic librarianship. We are being forced, rather gently of course, to become innovative, creative, cooperative, and even stingy. We have to use what we have more and better and we must try very hard not to obtain what we would not use. In other words, we have to try to become cost-effective in academic libraries. To accomplish this, we will have to cooperate more actively with faculty, students, researchers, administrators and other academic libraries. We will

have to reexamine our priorities, our professional goals and our library's objectives. We may have to become more actively involved in the planning process on our campuses, especially in the area of curriculum development and we will have to develop new strategies for better planning and for collection development. It will be necessary for us to become more responsible to our users and our administration in the areas of services and collection development.

Seven academic librarians are presenting their thoughts and experiences on collection development now and in the near future. We are grateful to them for their contributions.

A few recent references are listed below to encourage further reading in the area of collection development.

1. Farber, Evan I. "Collection Development from a College Perspective: A Comment and a Response." Colleges and Research Libraries 40 (July, 1979):325-326.

2. Magill, Rose Mary and Mona East. "Collection Development in Large University Libraries." In Advances in Librarianship 8(1978):1-54.

3. Massman, Virgil F. "Changes That Will Affect College Library Collection Development." In Academic Libraries by the Year 2000. Essays Honoring Jerrold Orne, pp. 152-164. Edited by Herbert Poole. New York: Bowker, 1977.

4. Miller, William and D. Stephen Rockwood. "Collection Development from a College Perspective." College and Research Libraries 40 (July, 1979):318-324.

5. New Horizons for Academic Libraries ACRL, 1978. Edited by Robert D. Stueart and Richard D. Johnson. New York:K.G. Saur, 1979. Section VII on Resources, pp. 424-528.

6. "Pittsburgh University Studies of Collection Usage: A Symposium." Journal of Academic Librarianship 5 (May, 1979):60-70.

7. Webb, William H. "Collection Development for the University and Large Research Library: More and More Verses Less and Less." In Academic Libraries by the Year 2000. Essays Honoring Jerrold Orne, pp. 139-151. Edited by Herbert Poole. New York: Bowker, 1977.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC & RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Ronald G. Leach
Central Michigan University

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak today on the subject of budget implications for collection development in academic and research libraries. I have been told that in addition to talking about budget implications and collection development in general, I should feel free to talk about specific experiences at my own institution, Central Michigan University.

I believe that it is important to begin almost any presentation on budgeting and collection development with a background discussion concerning what I call the environmental effects on the academic library budget. These environmental effects include the following: Knowledge explosion, obsolescence of information, inflation, dwindling resources, and technology.

We have all heard or read about the knowledge explosion and the corresponding increase in publications. The implications for library budgets are staggering. No library can expect to purchase all of the materials being published in any one year. For example, approximately 30,000 books are published in the United States alone each year. In addition, serials, government documents, foreign publications and an increasing variety of special materials must be considered by librarians when selecting for a collection. The creation of information, and resulting publication, has simply expanded at a faster rate than a library can be expected to keep up with. Chemistry literature alone is doubling approximately every eight years. Librarians will have to spend wisely and make difficult choices to select the items which are most needed at their institution.

The second environmental effect, is obsolescence of information and it is in part directly related to the explosion of information. Some fields, particularly those in science, are changing very rapidly. For example, most books in Computer Science become obsolete rather quickly because of growth and change in the field. The books purchased two years ago on Jupiter and Mars leave a lot to be desired in light of space explorations this year. Most books in microbiology are probably outdated in five to seven years. The difficulty then that academic libraries face, is that they must use funds of a limited budget to update or replace books that they may have purchased in the last two to ten years.

Dwindling resources and severe inflation are two environmental problems which are having and will continue to have a drastic impact on library budgets. Most institutions of higher education are already facing, and will continue to face, a drop in student enrollment. This is primarily because the 18- to 22-year-old pool from which the colleges and universities have traditionally drawn upon, is much smaller now and will continue to remain smaller at least for the next 15 to 20 years. This reduction in student enrollment simply means that the library will have to work harder to get--or keep--its share of dwindling resources. Except for a fortunate few, libraries will be unable to build local collections at the same rate as they have in the past because of two restrictions: 1) there simply will not be adequate resources from society to institutes of higher education and from the institutions to the library to meet the collection development needs and 2) rapidly rising inflation will cut deeply into our budgets causing us to fall further behind. Rising material costs have substantially outstripped increases in library materials budgets. For example, since 1970, many ARL Libraries have experienced 25 to 50 percent

reductions in their acquisitions rates. Nationally, the average price of books rose 129 percent from $8.77 in 1969 to $20.10 in 1973. At the same time, the average price periodicals rose 218 percent in 1969 to $27.58 in 1978. It is extremely important that academic libraries monitor and document their own local experiences that relate to inflation of library materials so that documented presentations can be made to the university central administration for funding.

In addition to dwindling resources and severe inflation, academic libraries must give their attention to another environmental problem area which has a significant impact on collection development budgets and here I am referring to the continuing commitments for serials publications. During the 1950s and 1960s, it became necessary to develop large research collections to support the growing research programs at many American universities. While the importance of these collections cannot be over-emphasized, they have left an expensive legacy and greatly influenced the options available for future collection development.

We are all familiar with the difficulty of reducing commitments to historically strong collections and in that sense, current collection allocation decisions are frequently the product if not the prisoner of the past. Continuing commitments for serial publications account for an ever increasing proportion of libraries' materials budget, up to 70 or 80 percent in some libraries, and if the library also has an approval plan or blanket ordering plans, there are very few funds remaining for individual discretionary purchases. Since the inflation factor is higher for serials than monographs, academic libraries' budget problems are only compounded when 70 to 80 percent of their budget is allocated for serials.

The last environmental problem which I would like to talk about, and which will have significant impact on the academic library budget in relation to collection development, is technology. Academic libraries will find at first that due to the initial expense of applying technology, especially computers, the existing limited budgets will be strained even further. However, the application of technology to the libraries may eventually result in a positive impact on the academic library budget. The use of computers, tele-communications and other technologies, will enable libraries to have access to each other's collections and do more resource sharing. In past years, libraries have attempted to serve their clients from their own collections as much as possible, utilizing interlibrary loan mechanisms as a supplement. However, decreasing purchasing power, increased use of technology and increasing service goals have in recent years, caused many libraries to view the collection "as being not only the materials possessed by the individual library, but the materials owned by other institutions as well." The application of computer technology to libraries will assist in identifying library materials in libraries which can be used on a shared basis and thus have specific implications for collection development budget.

I have tried to cover some of the most significant factors which I feel will have impact on the academic library budget as it relates to collection development. I would like to now turn for the remaining few moments and talk about budgeting for collection development at Central Michigan University.

In the past, allocations for library materials were made primarily by broad subject areas such as education, social science, humanities, and science. The allocations were made mostly on a historical basis and the areas within social science and humanities tended to be funded at a fairly high rate

because it was felt that the library was their laboratory. One of the difficulties in using only an historical approach to allocation is that the collection may be out of balance because a particular area was funded at a high level years ago, when new programs were established, but has not been re-evaluated to determine if it still needs a high level of funding.

Approximately three years ago, we changed our allocation procedure at Central. This was in part due to the fact that we increased the number of librarians who had bibliographical responsibilities from 5 to 15. Rather than one librarian having bibliographical responsibilities for all of the academic departments within, for example, social sciences, these responsibilities were assigned to several librarians. We used a combination of allocation methods at Central. First, we allocate funds to library bibliographers not teaching departments, for the academic discipline. This allows us to monitor the progress in a particular discipline and avoids any one area being overlooked or treated inadequately. In order to accommodate the interdisciplinary type of materials, we established general funds for broader categories, such as, social science general, science general, education general, and so forth. We also allocate funds by units within the library, for example: the Reference Department, Reserve Collection, and library staff. Lastly, in a few instances we allocate funds by format and type of materials, such as 16mm films and the browsing collection.

As Associate Director of Libraries, one of my responsibilities is the overall coordination of collection development. Allocations just mentioned are established by me after input from our Acquisitions and Serials Librarians and from a Collection Development Committee made up of six library bibliographers.

We are not using formula budgeting approach at Central Michigan University. While it has it's merits, I personally feel that there are a number of difficulties in implementing formula budgeting. First, while a formula does lend some objectivity, the makeup of the formula itself is very subjective in that one has to determine the variables and include weighting factors for each one. Second, it is often difficult to obtain the data necessary for the development of a formula, ie., circulation data may not be available. Third, a formula is often not flexible enough to accommodate program and political needs.

While we do not use formula budgeting at Central, we do look at certain information that would perhaps normally be included in a formula in order to obtain background for making more realistic allocations. We look at the number of student credit hours generated in a department, the level of programs offered, number of faculty in the department, the cost of literature for an academic discipline, the historical development of the collection and the development of new programs. By developing a method of allocating a specific amount of funds to a bibliographer for a particular academic discipline, we are able to institute some control in the development of the collection and we are able to monitor the progress in each area and to insure a certain amount of selectivity in order to make our funds go farther.

Monitoring of expenditures is done by our Acquisitions Librarian, who has developed various instruments which enable us to monitor not only by discipline, but also by type of material and format. This is a rather sophisticated instrument which is operated manually and we look forward to the day when we might apply the computer to the task. Monitoring has had a significant impact on our collection development budget. It has enabled us

to determine in detail at what dollar level we are supporting specific disciplines and with what type and format of material.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY RELATED TO THE ALLOCATION OF LIBRARY BOOK FUNDS

Allen, Kenneth S. Current and Emerging Budgeting Techniques in Academic Libraries, Including a Critique of the Model Budget Analysis Program of the State of Washington. Seattle: University of Washington, 1972.

American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for College Libraries; Approved as Policy by the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries, on July 3, 1975." College & Research Libraries News 9 (October, 1975): 277-279.

Axford, H. William, ed. "Effective Resource Allocation in Library Management." Library Trends 23 (April, 1975). Entire Issue.

Bach, Harry. "Why Allocate?" Library Resources and Technical Services (Spring, 1964): 161-165.

Burton, Robert E., "Formula Budgeting: An Example." Special Libraries 66 (February, 1975): 61-67.

Clapp, Verner W. and Robert T. Jordan. "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections." College and Research Libraries 26 (September 1965): 371-380.

Cohen, Jackson B. "Science Acquisitions and Book Output Statistics." Library Resources and Technical Services 19 (Fall, 1975): 370-379.

Dillehay, Bette. "Book Budget Allocation: Subjective or Objective Approach." Special Libraries 62 (December, 1971): 509-514.

Georgi, Charlotte. "Beating Inflation in Libraries". Special Libraries 66 (May-June, 1975): 241-244.

Gold, Steven D. "Allocating the Book Budget: an Economic Model." College and Research Libraries 36 (September, 1975): 397-402.

Goyal, S. K. "Allocation of Library Funds to Different Departments of a University: An Operational Research Approach." College and Research Libraries 34 (May, 1973): 219-222.

Headings, Bernice E. "The Formulation of a Book Budget Policy for Small College Libraries." Wilson Library Bulletin 26 (January, 1952): 389-393.

Kohut, Joseph J. "Allocating the Book Budget: a Model." College and Research Libraries 35 (May 1974): 192-199.

Kohut, Joseph J. and John F. Walker. "Allocating the Book Budget: Equity and Economic Efficiency." College and Research Libraries 36 (September, 1975): 403-410.

McGrath, William E. "An Allocation Formula Derived from a Factor Analysis of Academic Departments." College and Research Libraries 30 (January, 1969): 51-62.

McGrath, William E. "A Pragmatic Book Allocation Formula for Academic and Public Libraries with a Test for its Effectiveness." Library Resources and Technical Services 19 (Fall, 1975): 356-369.

Pierce, Thomas John. "The Economics of Library Acquisitions: a Book Budget Allocation Model for University Libraries." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1976.

Pierce, Thomas John. "Empirical Approach to the Allocation of the University Library Book Budget." Collection Management 2 (Spring, 1978): 39-58.

Randall, Gordon E. "Randall's Rationalized Ratios." Special Libraries 66 (January, 1975): 6-11.

Sampson, Gary S. "Allocating the Book Budget: Measuring for Inflation." College and Research Libraries 39 (September, 1978): 381-383.

Schad, Jasper G. "Allocating Book Funds: Control of Planning?" College and Research Libraries 31 (May, 1970): 155-159.

Schad, Jasper G. "Allocating Materials Budgets in Institutions of Higher Education." Journal of Academic Librarianship 3 (January 1978): 328-332.

Sellers, David Y. "Basic Planning and Budgeting Concepts for Special Libraries." Special Libraries 64 (February, 1973): 70-75.

Voight, Melvin J. "Acquisition Rates in University Libraries." College and Research Libraries 36 (July, 1975): 263-271.

Washington (State). Office of Interinstitutional Studies. A Model Budget Analysis System for Program 05 Libraries. Olympia, Washington, 1970.

BUDGET ALLOCATION AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Eleanor H. Pinkham
Kalamazoo College

Important observations concerning the budget and its impact on collection development for a university library have been discussed elsewhere in this seminar. Much of what was presented applies to a college library in equal measure; there are, however, differences. Small undergraduate colleges usually depend more heavily on the subject expertise of the faculty for collection development and rarely on approval plans for current acquisitions. The demands for extensive purchasing of research materials are more limited at the college level. Also, the college library usually does not enjoy the same degree of autonomy as does the university library; book budgets may be controlled partially or fully by faculty departments or by faculty committees. Whatever the differences, the overall goals are the same, and so we can, perhaps, be instructed by one another's experiences.

Early in my tenure as director of the Kalamazoo College library, the problems of rapid inflation and a tightening college budget called for a careful scrutiny of our acquisitions and collection development practices. It was evident that in order to continue to provide a collection which would adequately support the curricular needs of the students, it would be necessary to examine more critically the criteria for selection of materials and the method of allocating funds.

An analysis of the library's selection criteria resulted in a written collection development policy statement. This important first step proved to be a useful guide to both faculty and library staff. Attention was then turned to allocation of the budget. The system for allocating the materials

budget at Kalamazoo College was at that time historical, with budget increases distributed more or less equitably among the various library and academic departments either by percentages or straight dollar amounts. While there were a few problem areas, overall one could assume that this practice had adequately served the needs of the college, because the collection was generally regarded to be well balanced. It did, however, seem desirable to examine some elements of the budget more closely. Traditionally, a portion of the book budget (approximately 36 percent) was allocated for ordering by departmental faculty, with the understanding that funds not encumbered after seven months reverted to the general book fund, and that the final decision for any purchase rested with the librarian. Upon examination, it appeared that the needs of the departments were not always reflected accurately in these budget allocations, and that it would be valuable to compare allocations based on the current distribution practice with those of a system determined by more clearly articulated, objective criteria. The decision was made to devise a model which would specifically reflect the goals and priorities of the new collection development guidelines and which could be understood easily and justified rationally.

A number of guiding principles were adopted as the initial planning advanced. First, it was essential that control of library expenditures remain within the library. While the library staff depends to a large degree on the subject expertise of the faculty for book selection, there is significant inconsistency in the quality of ordering among faculty and departments, and the library staff must be in a position to ensure proper attention to all parts of the collection. Second, the model finally adopted had to be recognized by all as an effective planning tool as well as a tool for control.

Third, the factors used to determine fund allocation needed to be as objective as possible, in order to assure adequate support by the college community and to avoid the possibility of political pressuring and manipulation. Finally, it seemed essential that radical alterations to existing department allocations be avoided, preferring instead to implement planned changes gradually. A college faculty very often assumes a proprietary interest in its library, and changes that need to occur must be perceived as being in the best interest of the faculty and their departments.

From a review of the literature and from discussions with a number of faculty colleagues, a set of variables emerged which were considered to be important factors in determining departmental needs for library resources and for which reliable data were available. The elements finally selected for use in the model were: the average cost per book in each subject area; the number of titles published annually in the subject area; the number of full-time equivalent faculty in the department, averaged over the most recent three years; the number of unique courses offered by the department, again using a three year average; the total number of students enrolled in academic classes in the department; and the number of students majoring in the department, both averaged over three years.

Working with a campus statistician, a number of proposed equations were tested, with the variables grouped in alternate ways. The formula chosen was the one which proved to be the most statistically valid, as well as the one most clearly approximating current allocations. When the allocations of the new formula were compared with those of the former budget, a number of positive and negative deviations resulted, all of which could be reasonably supported. As a final step, a computer program was written so that

allocations could be calculated annually by inputting the revised data into the computer.

The purpose for giving this abbreviated case history is to demonstrate what can be learned from the experience of developing a model rather than to recommend a specific allocation formula. In the course of the Kalamazoo College project a large number of factors had to be examined which to a greater or lesser degree shape the development of a library's collection and affect its ability to meet the resource needs of its students. Further, it was necessary to begin to understand how these factors relate to one another. It is informative to look at the work of William McGrath using factor analysis in determining an allocation formula. He identifies and establishes correlations for over forty unique elements, including data for books published, the effect of the existing collection, faculty load, courses taught, enrollment, circulation, interlibrary loan, and references in theses. Finally, after all the elements for a model have been identified, there is the question of how they are to be weighted.

The process for developing a model also obliges one to look at the data gathering that is done within the library. Is it the most useful? Would different data be more informative? Development of a model is clearly limited by the data which is readily available. Another consideration is the appropriateness of allocating to departments. Perhaps it might be better to allocate according to broader subjects, or specific subjects, or to include all forms of material, or to allocate units rather than dollars. Finally, one must begin to find ways to systematically test the effectiveness of the entire collection development effort.

If the construction of a model appears to be a time consuming endeavor and to raise more questions than it answers, that is often the case. However, the value to the library is as much in the process as in the product, and it is the process which is being recommended. Consider developing your own formula for allocation, for that is the most instructive. If the necessary statistical skills are lacking, choose instead a model described in the literature. Some are more statistically valid than others, none is perfect, but all are thought-provoking. It is clear that formula allocation will not solve all of a library's collection development problems; however, it will facilitate the accurate identification of those problems and will provide an effective working instrument which the skilled librarian can then "fine tune."

COLLECTION BUILDING: COMMUNICATION ISSUES FOR LIBRARIANS AND FACULTY

Carol Juth-Gavasso
Hope College

Haney, at the beginning of his article on perception borrowed a cartoon from Redbook, showing a father and his young son walking in the snow. The snow was pictured as being knee-high on the father and neck-high on the son. The caption, with the father speaking, read: "This is nothing. When I was your age the snow was so deep it came up to my chin!" Haney used this cartoon to illustrate the point that each of us may have a different perception of a given situation.[1]

Perception, because it is based on such factors as age, sex, ethnic background, social status and life history, biases the way in which we view the world. One's perception, in most instances, is very selective. We perceive things according to our own self-interest. Few of us widen our perceptions and our perspectives when we communicate with others. In other words, if the father in the cartoon had widened his perceptions, he would have realized that his son was experiencing what he himself had experienced as a child.

Varying perceptions will exist whenever two or more people interact and communicate on a given issue. In academic libraries at least three differing perceptions exist concerning the library's collection. The faculty, the students and the librarians all perceive the library and its collection in different terms. Some of these perceptions are:

FACULTY: "The library is okay. I order anything I want. Just too bad they don't have enough money."

"The library - I'm not keen about getting the third degree every time I make a request or check out a book."

"The library - I guess it's ok for the students but it doesn't fit my needs. I'm into research on fluid-film bearings."

STUDENTS: "The library - they never have anything I need!"

"The librarians want to shove everything at you. All I wanted was a book review."

"I was able to get away for three years without having to use it."

LIBRARIANS: "The faculty doesn't seem to require research any more. No wonder our students are so ill-prepared."

"Faculty never involve us in what they are doing. We seem to spend more money, but have the wrong collection."

"The faculty and students on this campus don't think we know anything except how to check out books."

The sampling of perceptions just listed tend to form a rather negative climate on campuses toward the library. It will be suggested that librarians can alter this negative environment by broadening their perceptions and utilizing some effective communication techniques. This is not to suggest that the entire burden or responsibility of change is on the librarian. The faculty members and the students should also change their perceptions, but librarians must be responsible for initiating the change. Since it is primary responsibility of both faculty and librarians to ensure that the student's academic needs are being met, the remainder of this paper will focus on how faculty and librarians communicate about what constitutes a relevant collection for the library and why such communication is or is not effective.

One of the first things that must be done is for librarians to ascertain what it is that they want from the faculty in terms of collection building. Such a reckoning usually involves the issue of who presently controls the major portion of the book and periodical budget. Librarians seem to be in three positions and each of these positions has inherent communication concerns.

I. They want to <u>decrease</u> faculty involvement in the budget.

II. They want to <u>increase</u> faculty involvement with budget.

III. They want to <u>share equitably</u> (note: not <u>equally</u>) with faculty responsibility for development of the collection.

I. <u>LESS FACULTY INVOLVEMENT</u>

On many campuses, librarians have allocated the major portion of their book and periodical budgets to the departments under the assumption that faculty have the most expertise for collection development in a given discipline. In most instances, this practice has resulted in a collection that is heavily biased towards faculty research interests and not based on students' needs. This policy is particularly disastrous for the small college library and is reflective of something Evan Farber calls the "university-library syndrome."[2] Miller and Rockwood also point out the dangers inherent in such a policy.

> "First, we must now recognize very frankly that our primary client is the student and not the faculty member and collect with that fact in mind. This is radical doctrine, which many faculty members would undoubtedly find unpalatable, but it is the inevitable conclusion we draw from Farber's work. As undergraduate teaching institutions, colleges cannot afford to devote much of their resources to highly specialized research materials, even when these would facilitate faculty dissertations and publication."[3]

COMMUNICATION CONCERNS: Librarians who wish to decrease faculty involvement in budgetary decisions are in a very precarious political and communications position. The dynamics of the situation engender hostility on both sides. Librarians are angry that faculty are too much in control; faculty are unwilling to give up the control they have. Faculty generally perceive themselves as being excluded from too many things as it is on campuses. So, although both librarians and faculty are dependent on each other for good collection development, in this situation neither party is willing to drop their defenses and begin to communicate.

Realistically then, how does the librarian handle the situation. The librarians, particularly the directors, appear to have at least four options. First, faculty and/or departmental allocations can be cut. Second, the library can start denying certain requests even though the money has been allocated to the specific departments. Third, librarians can leave things as they are but work more aggressively with faculty suggesting specific purchases, demonstrating needs and the like.

Each of the three options just cited creates an inherently threatening and hostile climate. Regardless of all the good intentions and good will shown by either party (librarians and faculty), faculty will probably perceive themselves as being judged and being told to change their behavior. Thus, faculty may resist steps taken by librarians who move to implement any one of the three options listed.

A fourth, and perhaps the most workable situation is for the library to retain all real budgetary increases in their general budget and thus freeze departmental allocations. By using good communication techniques, it is believed that librarians could present this policy change to the faculty without damaging the relationship. Such action would require no behavioral change on the part of the faculty member, nor does it say to him or her that "they don't know how to select materials for the library."

In sum, in situations where librarians want to decrease faculty involvement in the selection of materials for the collection, they will be faced with a most difficult communications situation. When one party seeks as its end goal the reduction of another's authority, status, or privilege, the perceptions of the party who is losing the authority, status, or privilege is likely to be negative towards those asking for the reduction. In such situations working relationships are rarely enhanced. This would be particularly true for those organizations that bill themselves as a service group existing to serve the needs of the entire community.

II. MORE FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Some librarians find themselves in a position of wanting more faculty input for their collection building endeavors. Such situations are often found in colleges where new programs are being introduced or where established departments are branching out into new areas. Librarians on these campuses are usually faced, halfway through the semester, by students from these new courses who demand to know why the library doesn't have anything

they can use. Such instances tend to engender a negative climate because the librarians perceive themselves as the 'fall guy' for inadequate planning by the faculty. Librarians, then, become increasingly angry and frustrated while they play the game of catch-up in terms of the book collection.

On other campuses, some librarians may wish to have more faculty involvement for a variety of reasons: they see budget cuts in the future and would like input for setting priorities; they perceive a lack of use and wonder why; or they are tired of hearing complaints "that the library never seems to have anything anyone needs"; or they finally realize that they are dependent on faculty expertise to ensure a good library collection.

COMMUNICATION CONCERNS: In situations where librarians want more involvement on the part of the faculty, they will have to be particularly sensitive to the perceptions held by the faculty. Generally speaking, if librarians are not already on campus curriculum committees or actively involved in faculty or student research, they are probably perceived by faculty and students as having little to offer in these matters. Librarians will need to alter such perceptions before they can expect to obtain any real faculty involvement. The term real is emphasized because on many campuses there is often symbolic involvement through a library committee that does very little.

In summary, the librarians' primary task will be to become visible to the faculty. This can be accomplished through the standard

techniques learned in library school (route reviews, talk with faculty, committees) in conjunction with good communication skills that will foster a supportive climate on campus. More will be said about communication skills later.

III. EQUITABLE FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Equitable responsibility shared by librarians and faculty members for collection development is the most ideal situation in which to be. In such situations, librarians and faculty would work together to build an adequate collection suited to the needs of the students on that campus. However, to effect this kind of a climate on a campus requires that each party involved be aware of and sensitive to the perceptions, needs and goals of the other. Each party must communicate with those issues (perceptions, needs and goals) in mind.

In this situation, faculty and librarians would share equitably (note; not necessarily equally) in the budget. Faculty would not have major control of the budget as they did in situation I, nor would they merely be advisory as they were in situation II. The exact procedure whereby an equitable budget is established is not within the realm of this paper except to state that the exact proportions would vary from campus to campus and be influenced by such factors as the degree of expertise of faculty and librarians, size of the budget, present collection, and so on.

Before progressing any farther, let me focus on this communication issue that I have been alluding to throughout this paper. Jack

Gibb, in an article on defensive communication, identified a number of characteristics which engender either a hostile or supportive climate.[4]

Often unperceived to people involved in a discussion, their attitudes and feelings are evident to a listener even though exact words are not uttered. The following chart is a modified version of Gibb's identified characteristics adapted to a library situation.

A MODIFIED MODEL OF GIBB'S "CATEGORIES OF BEHAVIOR CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPPORTIVE AND DEFENSIVE CLIMATES IN SMALL GROUPS"

DEFENSIVE CLIMATE	SUPPORTIVE CLIMATE
1. EVALUATION Indicators: Passing judgment; questioning another's ability to do something. Situations: Librarians often pass judgment on the adequacy of faculty purchases. Faculty often question librarians' ability to select items in their discipline.	1. DESCRIPTION Indicators: Nonjudgment: presenting feelings, perceptions that do not imply that the receiver change. Situations: Librarians who offer to check a new faculty member's class bibliography to ensure that the library's collection can meet his/her teaching needs.
2. CONTROL Indicators: Attempts to change the attitudes or behavior of another. Assumption of change agent is that person to be changed is inadequate. Situations: Librarians who think faculty can no longer be responsible to select materials and want control back. Faculty who don't trust librarians to select materials in their subject area because they do not have a degree in the discipline.	2. PROBLEM ORIENTATION Indicators: Communication; desire to collaborate in defining and solving mutual problems; implies no pre-conceived solutions. Situations: Librarians and faculty who work together to establish collection needs and priorities.
3. STRATEGY Indicators: Manipulation; making others think that decisions reached were their own. Situations: Librarians who use budgetary excuses for denying a department's request while granting another's rather than honestly establishing priorities for the year.	3. SPONTANEITY Indicators: Free of deception; honesty. Situations: Librarians who, when communicating with faculty, are honest and open about the priorities and expenditures of the library.

DEFENSIVE CLIMATE	SUPPORTIVE CLIMATE
4. NEUTRALITY Indicators: Expressing lack of concern. Situations: When either librarians or faculty do not take into account the frustrations, needs, wishes, or perceptions of the other party.	4. EMPATHY Indicators: Expressing respect; worth of listener implied; sense of sharing. Situations: Faculty and librarians who come together to solve mutual problems, e.g. library can't afford SSCI but could budget a limited number of computer searches for faculty.
5. SUPERIORITY Indicators: Arouse feelings of inadequacy. Situations: Faculty who scorn BCL in favor of their list of classics. Librarians who smugly show a new indexing or abstracting tool to a faculty member.	5. *EQUALITY and EQUITY Indicators: Mutual trust; acknowledgment of differences but using those differences to solve mutual problems. Situations: Librarians and faculty working jointly to establish needs and priorities of the library collection. A well-working library or curriculum committee with librarians as members.
6. CERTAINTY Indicators: Dogmatic; seeming to know the answer; needing no additional information. Situations: Librarians who use and cite to faculty members as the authority list, BCL. Faculty who feel that they know all the relevant references and research in a given area and do not need help or other suggestions.	6. PROVISIONALISM Indicators: Willingness to experiment with one's behavior; investigate issues rather than take sides. Situations: Librarians who willingly accept suggestions as to what should be in the collection from faculty, students, printed lists, etc. Faculty who are willing to review for purchase suggestions from Library Journal, in addition to their own professional journals.

*Gibb identified only the concept of equality in his original work. However, it is felt that in situations where there may be wide discrepancies in knowledge (MSL in Librarianship vs PhD in Chemistry), that these differences should not necessarily be ignored or discounted. Rather, equity, in terms of knowledge and responsibility, should be used in terms of evaluating items for the library collection. Faculty might be responsible for title recommendations, but librarians would be responsible for ensuring a balanced collection fulfilling the needs of the students.

The question that now needs to be addressed is: Who on the library staff is in the best position to utilize supportive communication techniques with faculty members to ensure adequate collection development? The answer is: the reference librarian, or the librarian involved in bibliographic instruction. "Why not the director?" you ask. First, the library director is in an inherently political position because of the decisions that he or she is required to make. These decisions, regardless of how well they are received by the faculty as a whole, will still tend to color the faculty's perception of the library. Second, the director is often too far removed from daily interaction at the reference desk. Thus, patterns of questions and gaps in the collection are not so readily visible to him or her.

How do reference librarians and faculty members equitably build a library collection? It is suggested here that equitable collection building is accomplished via librarian-faculty communication about the reference needs of the students. Let me illustrate exactly what is meant by this:

> Situation: For the third time in one day a student has approached the reference desk to ask for the Computer Yearbook. The library does not own it. The student, showing frustration, maintains that the professor said that "any good library would have a copy." At this point both the librarian and the student are in defensive postures. The librarian's perception of the faculty member is poor; the student's perception of the library

and the librarian are poor.

> The librarian needs to shift gears and begin to think in and utilize supportive communication techniques. The librarian can suggest to the student that he or she will telephone the faculty member and ask for clarification of the problem. Upon contacting the professor, the librarian will state that one of his or her students is present and wishes to use Computer Yearbook but the item is not owned by the library. Does she or he agree that Computing Reviews would be just as appropriate for the type of information sought by the students or is there some other resource that should be used?

Handling a defensive situation in the manner described above accomplishes three things. First, it immediately aids the student and assures him or her that an alternative resource is acceptable. Second, it alerts both the faculty member and the librarian to a potentially weak spot in the collection. Third, it paves the way to close this exposed gap through cooperative efforts of collection building.

After the immediate situation is handled and the librarian has had a chance to do some checking, he or she may contact the faculty member again and discuss the weaknesses of the collection in that particular area. Weaknesses can then be remedied by having librarians suggest or solicit specific titles for purchase.

Immediate situations, like the one just described, are often far more effective than any scheduled meeting with faculty could ever be. In such a situation, both the librarian and the faculty member are focused on the same goal - the immediate needs of the student. The situation is not contaminated by faculty concerns about their research area, nor is it burdened by librarians' goals of having complete and perfect collections.

All this sounds too good to be true you say. Does it really work that well? Where are the problems? Yes, it can and does work. And yes, there are often some problems involved. The primary source of the problems, unfortunately, is the rest of the library staff. Staff members do not fully perceive the role of the reference librarian in this situation. Acquisitions people may question the librarian's signature on a departmental order, even though it was authorized by the department over the phone while in discussion with the reference librarian. Directors may be threatened by the increased involvement of reference librarians with faculty members. Competition and jealousy between reference librarians often arises. However, many of these defensive climates can be resolved by a strong director who consciously utilizes supportive communication techniques. The way in which he or she accomplishes this is another whole paper in itself.

In conclusion, we will quote a recent statement made by Evan Farber:

> "It is more likely that most faculty members can't be depended upon to maintain some sort of balance in the library's collection, but that is where the librarian comes in: to suggest titles for filling in gaps and, more important, to work with faculty and help them

develop a wider perspective. The library collection is not an end in itself: It exists primarily to support the teaching program, and teachers should be interested in making sure the collection does that. If they do not, then it's up to the librarian, but he or she should always be conscious of faculty expertise and responsibility."[5]

REFERENCES

1. William V. Haney, "Perception and Communication," in Interpersonal Communication in Action, ed. Bobby R. Patton and Kim Griffin (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), pp. 168-187.

2. Evan I. Farber, "Collection Development from a College Perspective: A Comment and a Response," College and Research Libraries 40 (July, 1979): 325-326.

3. William Miller and D. Stephen Rockwood, "Collection Development from a College Perspective," College and Research Libraries 40 (July, 1979): 318-324.

4. Jack R. Gibb, "Defense Communication," Journal of Communication 11 (September, 1961): 141-148.

5. Evan I. Farber, p. 326.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: INVOLVEMENT WITH FACULTY THROUGH CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Adella B. Scott
Washtenaw Community College

I would like to begin with some general comments about library collections in community colleges. I think this is pertinent to our topic today because the librarian must devise his or her strategies for involving faculty in collection development according to the particular type of college and library.

Library collections in community colleges have certain unique features:

1. Audio-visual materials make up a larger percentage of the total collection than in other college libraries.
2. The traditional subjects in the liberal arts curriculum are represented but there is also a large segment of the collection which provides technical and occupational information for lay and professional readers.
3. Special collections are often developed on subjects that reflect the regional location of the college, an occupational interest of the community residents, or occasionally, and not always desirably, a special interest or avocation of the administrator to whom the Learning Resource Center director reports.
4. The book and periodical collections include titles which are geared to public library readership along with the more academic materials supporting the curriculum.
5. Although few primary sources are collected for research purposes, the myriad subjects represented by secondary sources are sometimes staggering.

You have probably surmised that a community college library collection reflects quite accurately the curriculum offerings at the college. This is indeed the case. At Washtenaw Community College the enrollment is split almost equally between students taking general education courses and those taking vocational or occupational courses. We librarians try to vigorously select materials to support the vital areas in these two divisions. We also try to serve the needs of our many students who do not have access to a public library in their locality and depend on us to provide them with recreational reading and information on consumer issues.

Although our budget for audio-visual acquisitions is apportioned by departmental areas, we do not divide up the much larger book budget in this way. Instead the librarian selectors are responsible for balanced collection development.

In spite of our best efforts to solicit recommendations and selection advice from our faculty members, which is so necessary for balance and currency, the librarians at Washtenaw Community College make the selection decisions on approximately two thirds of the titles ordered. We are clearly then the most responsible for ensuring that the library collection continues to support the curriculum. This is a heavy responsibility for if one examines the curriculum offerings carefully over a few years, one discovers that under the umbrella of general and occupational education have appeared and then disappeared many different courses and sometimes entire programs.

In a college where an unwieldy, amorphous curriculum is ever changing in response to the college's mission to serve the community, keeping the library collection up-to-date and appropriate is no small chore. Without gazing into

a crystal ball how then is one to predict the future needs and demands which the library will want to first anticipate and then satisfy?

This question may be better answered if we first review our past experiences at Washtenaw Community College in trying to anticipate curricular needs.

Until 1978 the librarian selectors were not always engaged in productive planning. We attempted to anticipate curriculum changes and developments by keeping in contact with instructors and administrators but we found our role was cast more often as a reactor than as a stimulator or catalyst.

Let us look at an example of the frustration we were experiencing as reactors.

In 1975 the college decided to introduce a Legal Assistant program in the business area. The Learning Resource Center became aware of the program during the first week of the first semester of course offerings when many students arrived in the library looking for Michigan statutes and court decisions. The librarians quickly reacted and mustered up a committee of instructors and advisors from the community and developed a list of acquisitions which would support this new popular program. We were fortunate in having a government grant that year to pay for the initial purchases required but we realized that we were committing the Learning Resource Center to expensive continuing subscriptions. We were encouraged, however, because the program was in great demand and the legal sets which we purchased were in almost constant use.

In January 1978 the program disappeared from the schedule. One course in legal research remained in the business offerings. Again the librarians reacted. What happened? Why was the program dropped? Why wasn't the

library informed? And now what were we to do about our impressive new legal reference collection and those expensive supplements?

This is a rather dramatic example of the circumstances in which we frequently found ourselves but the frustrating questions regarding curriculum continued to be asked.

How was one to know if courses on foster child care or emergency medicine would be of sufficient permanence to merit developing these subjects with books, periodicals and audio-visuals? Was a new course on leadership a one time response to a community demand or would it appear in the schedule next semester?

It became obvious to us that little constructive collection development could occur without a representative of the library becoming aggressively involved in curriculum at the developmental level. This we set out to do.

At our college courses and programs are developed by instructors and administrators but do not have any official sanction until they have been reviewed by the curriculum committee and the Dean of Instruction. The curriculum committee is made up of two faculty members, two administrators and two students. The instructor presents his proposal to the committee and bears the burden of proof of its need or desirability at that time. After the committee votes, the proposal is subject to review by President's Council before the course or program is accepted or rejected.

The librarians at Washtenaw Community College are faculty members. In order to secure the support of our faculty colleagues in the election of a Learning Resource Center librarian to the curriculum committee, we reminded

them that the librarian's broad based education and exposure to students' needs makes a librarian an ideal contributor to curriculum development. Our faculty colleagues responded by electing me to the curriculum committee in February 1978. I became chairperson of the committee shortly after.

The information which I have received while serving on the curriculum committee has been invaluable and has contributed significantly to more productive and intelligent collection planning by our staff in the library.

The librarian selectors are less likely in the future to mistakenly support popular but short lived programs as we have access to the instructor's research early in the program approval process. We are developing subject areas in the collection using now available objective data on community demand and college support. We do not find ourselves reacting to curricular faits accomplis.

Ideally the curriculum committee should have a permanent seat reserved for a Learning Resource Center representative. We are presently lobbying for that change in structure at our college.

Last spring I polled librarians in other Michigan community colleges about their experience in curriculum development at their colleges and the effects of new curricular offerings on their acquisitions. The results were interesting in that they so closely resembled my expectations.

All the respondents reported that the curricula at their colleges was constantly changing and a great diversity of new courses were recently being offered. Half of the respondents reported that they have a representative of the library on the curriculum review board or committee. These

respondents reported that when their budget permitted they were acquiring new materials to support new curricular offerings. The other respondents described their collection development activities as being somewhat haphazard in regard to new college offerings. Reminiscent of our previous experience at Washtenaw Community College, they were surprised by the appearance of new programs and were trying to cope with new demands by increased interlibrary loan and an occasional purchase. Most stated that this was an undesirable solution when trying to support popular new programs.

Most community colleges in Michigan have not experienced the reverses in enrollment and government financial support that several public four year institutions have experienced recently. The curricula in community colleges are still changing and growing with the vitality and clumsiness of an adolescent on the educational scene.

Library collections in these developing institutions need to stay current, challenging and appropriate to the different levels of instruction and readership.

In order to guarantee that the collection will be appropriate, librarians need to become more aggressive as responsible educators and take their place along-side other faculty members in developing curriculum.

WRITING THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY AT THE TANNAHILL RESEARCH LIBRARY

Joan W. Gartland
Tannahill Research Library

The Robert Hudson Tannahill Research Library is the museum library of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum. The collection was begun by Henry Ford who collected materials to document and complement the artifacts that he later put on display at Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum after its founding in 1929. Since that time, the library has grown through acquisitions and gifts, so that today it has over 400,000 items including books, periodicals, manuscripts, trade catalogs, broadsides, prints, photographs, maps, newspapers and music sheets.

The collection development policy that I will speak about today was drafted only a little over a month ago. Before this, there was no written policy, a situation which -- I have found -- is not unusual for museum libraries, for one reason or another. Since I had taken part in writing a collection development policy at the university library where I last worked, I felt that a written policy for the Tannahill Research Library might be useful, and the director of the library agreed.

This talk, then, will consist mainly of my impressions on writing such a policy. Since it is still in draft form, and it has not been generally circulated, it is still a tentative policy.

One of the major benefits of writing a collection development policy -- and this topic has been written on in the professional literature -- I'd remind you, for example, of Feng's paper -- [1] is that those who work on it are forced to ask themselves a number of questions, including:

1. What do we have in our collection, what are its particular strengths -- such as special collections, and what demands are presently being made on the collection?

2. Who are our patrons, whom do we serve, and what are the library's responsibilities to them?

3. What are the library's objectives, and this question is, of course, inextricably bound up with the question, whom do we serve?

With regard to the first question, the scope of the Tannahill Research Library's collections is very broad. In time, it extends from the 16th through to the 20th century; in diversity of materials, from the first map to depict the western hemisphere drawn by Sebastian Munster, c.1550, to a copy of Buck Rogers in the Twenty-Fifth Century. The collection, as a whole, is a collection of Americana, concentrating on documentation and research in American material culture, in areas including agriculture, transportation, communications, the decorative arts, domestic arts and technology. Among our special collections are trade catalogs, McGuffey readers (a collection begun by Henry Ford); manuscripts from Edison's Menlo Park Laboratory; the photographic archives of the Detroit Publishing Co.; the Early Bird Collection of materials on early aviation in the United States, to name only a few.

With regard to the second group of questions, our patrons are mainly staff, in particular curators, who are doing research related to the collections of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum. We also serve Friends (there are over 7,000 of them, but only a fraction of them use the library). This group of patrons are often researching some object they have at home in

order to date it or to find parallels. Then, there are scholars and other researchers outside Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum who are doing research on some aspect of Americana that brings them to our library.

With regard to the third set of questions, our primary objective is to serve the research needs of our staff as well as students involved in the educational programs and then also to serve researchers and the scholarly community outside Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum.

This, of course, is no small task, and one that we can not do alone. Because our staff is engaged in researching all aspects of American material culture from 1650-1950, it is impossible for our library to be self-sufficient and to satisfy all their needs and therefore we are fortunate in being located close to the University of Michigan-Dearborn, and not very far away from the Detroit Public Library and the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, all of whom have been generous in sharing their resources with us.

After reviewing these questions and answers, it seemed to me that our collection development policy must reflect both our responsibility to satisfy the current research needs of the staff, as well as the obligation to continue to develop special collections, so that the library can enhance its holdings of unique research materials which will serve a wide range of researchers.

I have a copy of the draft of this policy for those of you who might like to look at it at the end of the program. The policy is in the process of being circulated, so that the staff, including administrators and the curators who use the library most will be able to comment on it and make suggestions and recommendations.

Though I can not tell you what impact this statement will have, I can tell you some of the benefits which may, and I hope will, materialize from it.

First, I hope it will lead to more staff involvement in the collection development process. Our staff, particularly our curators, already are actively engaged in book selection, and send their recommendations for acquisitions to the library. I hope that after they have read the collection development policy, they will have a clearer picture of what the library is trying to do and where it is going, and that the policy will encourage them to bring to the library's attention materials available in their particular areas of expertise which could enhance the library's collections.

Secondly, (and perhaps this should be put first), I hope that this policy will bring to the administration's attention a clearer picture of the role of the library and what its objectives are, and that the administration will support the library through a strong (and I hope increased) budget. While ideally budgets should grow out of collection development policies, I think far too frequently it is the other way around. And when the economy is troubled, it is all too easy to forget about long term goals, and just "make do." A collection development policy that makes clear the importance of long term goals for a library, can, I think be of use at such a time.

Thirdly, I hope our collection development statement will help inform other libraries of our holdings, so that we can share resources more effectively and increase cooperation especially among neighboring institutions.

These are all "pros" for writing a collections development policy. Because my policy is only a draft, I am in the happy position of not having any "cons" to report to you. Perhaps if we meet again, the situation will be different. But for now, this talk can end on a completely optimistic note. To borrow from Emily Dickinson, "I dwell in possibility."

REFERENCES

1. Y. T. Feng, "The Necessity for a Collection Development Policy Statement," Library Resources and Technical Services 23 (Winter, 1979): 39-44.

WRITTEN POLICIES FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Shirley M. Smith
University of Michigan-Dearborn

The University of Michigan-Dearborn is a four-year institution, just twenty years old, with a full undergraduate program and several masters degree offerings as well. The library is not officially a unit within the Library System of the University of Michigan, although our students and faculty have access to the holdings of the Ann Arbor libraries. Because of our independent status, our library staff is responsible for developing full-service, stand-alone library programming and strong and balanced collections to support the U-M-Dearborn curriculum and research needs.

As an example of the way in which the Dearborn campus can move separately from the parent organization, our library decided to reorganize the program for collection development five years ago. Prior to that time, book selection had been carried out selectively, but almost intuitively, by a few of the librarians. As the campus entered a period of expansion and enrollment growth, a more carefully structured system of collection building was mandated, one that would involve all of the professional staff as well as faculty representatives from various departments and disciplines. The professors would know the course offerings in their areas and buy the necessary support materials; also, they should know the current literature of their fields and the recognized scholars whose works should be represented in the library. The librarians, with training and expertise in collection development, would acquire the retrospective titles, locate the lacunae, and preserve that important balance of viewpoints and concepts within the collections.

When you seek the aid and advice of the faculty in the acquisitions program of an academic library -- and especially when book funds are apportioned for their use, it can be argued that the librarians have lost control of collection development. It was our intention, however, that we should not relinquish our authority, that we should set forth our expertise to the faculty, maintain certain controls over their choice of materials, and insist that the final authority for acquisitions remain with our staff. Furthermore, by asking for faculty involvement, we recognized that we must define library objectives, provide a unilateral policy for the librarians, stating their responsibilities, and set forth strategies for wise selection of materials by both librarians and professors. Clearly, the need for a statement of policy was indicated.

Before beginning to write the policy statement there are a number of decisions to be made and policy matters to be addressed. These are the experiences I'd like to share with you. First, know your present collection, your clientele and your financial resources. While these seem to be statements of the obvious, they are fundamental information sources. Identify the strong collections within the total collection and decide whether you will simply preserve those holdings or expand them; also identify the weaker holdings and consider your obligations to strengthen them in view of curriculum and student need and interest. Define your clientele: the undergraduate, the masters and doctoral candidate, the research-oriented professor. Do you have an obligation to the community beyond your campus? Then, by knowing the financial resources of your library you can gauge the limitations to the collection you hope to build. The noblest policy statement is a hollow instrument without adequate funding over the long term. Secondly, the objectives of the library must be defined.

Undoubtedly, everyone on the staff has a vague understanding of the objectives, but now they must be put into writing. Every college or university library has as its primary function the support of the educational and research programs of the institution, but the nature and function of your particular library needs to be delineated. Will you strive to have a reasonably strong collection in all fields, as would be expected in a good college library, or will you try to have an exhaustive collection, to gain pre-eminence in certain areas as a major university would. What reliance will you have on larger research libraries through inter-library loan for those infrequently used materials for research? What are the short-term and the long-range goals and objectives for the library?

As inspirational material you should read -- or reread -- such major documents of librarianship as the Freedom to Read Statement, the Library Bill of Rights, and the Intellectual Freedom Statement that interprets the Bill of Rights. Academic libraries are generally not confronted with problems of censorship on controversial materials as are the public and school libraries but the basic tenets ought to be reviewed. There are also some new studies that might be useful: Investigations made by Professor Allen Kent at the University of Pittsburgh which have been critical of acquisitions programs of academic libraries.[1] The National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication, being conducted by social scientists, and soon to be released as a monograph, is based on visits to seven academic libraries, including Eastham College, and investigations of their collection development policies and practices.

Conduct a literature search. Borrow policy statements prepared at other institutions of like size to study format, inclusiveness. ALA Headquarters Library has some material selection policies that can be borrowed. These

will show you what has been done, but no one statement is applicable to two libraries. Know the acquisitions programs of neighboring libraries. With the trend toward cooperative efforts locally and regionally, any policy document in preparation should acknowledge the existence and role of nearby libraries, as well as any cooperative measures of acquisition among those libraries.

Determine what kind of written statement is needed in your library. Does any thread of policy now exist upon which you could begin to build? Identify and define your existing collection building practices and formulate a written policy based on your actual experiences. Decide whether you should have an acquisitions policy or a selection policy. Calvin Boyer, writing in Book Selection Policies in American Libraries, defines the two approaches as follows:

> "...acquisitions policy is a detailed breakdown, subject by subject, of the depth in which the library expects to acquire materials in each subject area.
>
> ...a selection policy sets down general policies concerning the intellectual framework within which the decisions are made, the final authority for selection decisions, the acceptable quality of materials, inclusion and exclusion of materials, weeding and discarding. The acquisitions policy generally is restricted to the subject of materials and the level of collecting, whereas the selection policy is more concerned with the form of the materials. Some statements contain elements of both types of approaches, and often the terms are used interchangeably. It's useful to both products, whenever possible."[2]

What are the components of the actual policy statement? Frequently, a statement of purpose for the written document is placed right at the beginning to clarify the intended function of what will follow. The objectives of the library are necessary, of course. The role of the persons -- librarians and faculty -- responsible for collection building

should be stated. Techniques, procedures and selection tools should be identified; for example, approval plans for blanket orders, if you use them; reliance upon publications such as Choice for reviews, the use of standard and retrospective bibliographies for recommended titles. Policies on multiple copies, gift books, government documents, serials, non-print materials such as audio tapes, video tapes, data tapes, maps, textbooks, musical scores, microforms, English and foreign language materials and your library's role in maintaining archival materials for your campus should be stated. Levels of collection intensity from limited to comprehensive might be indicated. Weeding the collection, certainly a form of collection maintenance, ought to be covered.

The policy should also include procedures for its own revision. Because your institution is a growing and evolving entity, change is inevitable, and a lack of flexibility in the written selection policy -- if that develops -- could be damaging. Make the document subject to review, perhaps once a year. Cite the process for identifying faults and describe the actual procedure for change.

At long last, you may be ready to write. Here are some suggestions:

1. Be certain that your statements do not have a defensive tone. State your reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of materials and the statements should be able to withstand the criticism of faculty or administrators.
2. The policy statement should be quite detailed or it won't be used. Write it for persons who know nothing about your library and its practices in collection building, new librarians who will join your staff in the year ahead or perhaps the new professor who just completed his doctoral

work at the University of California-Berkeley and wants to know why the library does not have all of his favorite things. Try to give a clear-cut answer to all questions, though that is indeed difficult. The more definitive it is, the better it will facilitate the making of judgments by librarians and faculty participating in the selection process.

3. Make sure that . is a strong enough statement to defend the library, if need be.

After the writing and numerous rewritings of the statement, another tedious process begins -- having it reviewed, criticized, analyzed word by word, tested, and made ready for implementation. Provide copies and plenty of time for each professional staff member who is involved in book selection to study the contents and then hold as many meetings as needed to consider all comments and concerns. After revisions have been made to the document, assemble the faculty library advisory committee or whatever group on your campus enables major library policy to become effective and again, provide opportunity for criticism. You must obtain the understanding and support of the facutly. Finally, the policy is ready to stand on its own and become the law behind your collection, to state what will be found on your library shelves and what will not.

Is it worth the trouble? Having spent a year planning and writing the materials selection policy statement for our library, I can well remember my own doubts about the usefulness of the project. As time wore on, my fear was that the policy would be out of date before it was drafted, but during that year and in the five years since, there have been no institutional changes requiring library policy changes. It is still current. The policy statement is not used on a daily basis; in fact, it gathers dust between

those occasions when a new staff member or faculty liaison person asks for clarification of selection policy. The reason for that is that its provisions are now second nature to those of us actively involved in selection. I also had concerns that the faculty would not abide by the document, especially if it interferred with their wishes. Instead, I have found that the professors like to know where the librarians stand on the responsibility of selecting books and journals, that there is not aimless, random buying. They know that the book budget will be well managed. They take pride in those portions of the book collection that, working together, we have been able to bring up to strength. The library is simply better understood since this codification of our selection practices.

Along the way to a policy statement -- and beyond -- I learned that we, as librarians do not have to be a self-effacing group of professionals, we can contribute appreciably to better teaching and learning on our campuses.

REFERENCES

1. Allen Kent et al., The Pittsburgh Library Use Study (New York: Mancel Dekker, 1979).

2. Calvin J. Boyer, ed., Book Selection Policies in American Libraries, An Anthology of Policies From College, Public, and School Libraries (Austin, Texas: Armedillo Press, 1971), p. 4.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESENTED PAPERS

Evan I. Farber
Earlham College

Before commenting on some of the points made in the papers, let me point to one omission that is particularly surprising these days: there is no mention of computer-based information systems. It may be that librarians are a bit tired of hearing about them, or it may be that I was especially struck by the omission because of an article I read very recently. The article, by F. W. Lancaster, Laura Drasgow and Ellen Marks, portrays libraries in 2001, and the authors predict that by that time electronic information systems will practically have displaced printed materials.[1] It is an interesting article, well worth reading, and though their speculations are a bit exaggerated, I think there is enough validity in them that one can't talk about the factors affecting collection building without considering the impact of electronic information sources. (It seemed significant to me, for example, that the article appeared in Collection Management.) There is not much question that the increasing availability of on-line services and increased patron use of them will affect the practice of budget allocation and space requirements, to name just two aspects of administration most closely related to collection building. How should these services be treated in a written policy? How is their cost measured if an allocation formula is used? Those are just two questions that immediately come to mind, but I'm sure there are many others, and it just seemed surprising to me that this most prominent and pervasive development was not touched upon at all.

In discussing the content of the papers, I should admit first of all that in my own library we do not have a written collection policy. That is due in part, at least, to simple laziness -- how large a part, I honestly don't know. I think it is small, and in any case I've even been able to rationalize it out of existence by attributing the lack of a written policy for the Earlham library to conscious choice. That rationale has two aspects: one, that I know the Earlham faculty, students and curriculum so well and am so attuned to them and to the college's objectives and direction that a written policy would be superfluous. Indeed -- and here is the second basis -- it might even prove restrictive by limiting the flexibility I now have, a flexibility that has permitted me to have a collection that (so far, anyway) has the approval of my various constituencies.

At the same time, I realize that my situation is, if not unique, uncommon, and that for most college and university libraries, a written collection development policy is at least desirable, and perhaps necessary. Eleanor Pinkham and Shirley Smith present clearly and persuasively the case for writing a collection development policy and provide eminently sensible "guiding principles" that any academic librarian can make good use of, both for planning and for implementation. If Kalamazoo College's policy proves to work as well as the careful thought and planning that went into it suggest it will, it might well serve as a model for other institutions.

Two of the papers -- those of Carol Juth-Gavasso and Adella Scott -- are

mainly concerned with the process of collection building and, in particular, the personal component: the importance of maintaining an equitable and harmonious relationship between librarians and teaching faculty in contributing to the process, and the need for keeping informed of college curricular and program developments that may affect aspects of collection policy. The latter point is one that has always bothered librarians. I remember years ago the librarian of one of our most prestigious colleges, a librarian thoroughly respected and admired by her faculty and administration, complaining that she was the last to find out that the college was embarking on a new program, one that could have a major impact on the library. How many times have I heard that complaint! Adella Scott makes the point that at a community college this is particularly troublesome because the course and program offerings, which need to respond to community needs and/or demands, can change so rapidly; she notes the usefulness of her having served on the curriculum committee, a post that permitted her to know what was going on. That is a point, I think, that should be stressed a bit more -- not because it's new to anyone, but because it is so crucial to keeping the collection attuned to the institution's needs. It is certainly desirable for a librarian to serve, as Adella Scott did, on the curriculum committee. But if this is not possible -- and in many institutions it may not be, for one reason or another -- then a librarian can perhaps serve as an ex officio member of the committee. This should even be acceptable to the less enlightened members of the administra-

tion or faculty, those who still object to librarians serving as regular members of faculty committees. And, as a matter of fact, serving in an ex officio capacity does in one way have an advantage: it insures a permanent place for a librarian on the committee, whereas serving as a regular member, either elected or appointed, means the real possibility of not being reelected or reappointed; after all, there may be many other faculty members who not only want to, but should have a chance to serve. Furthermore, since the librarian's purpose in being on the committee is primarily an informational one, then wanting to be a regular (i.e., voting) member may be desirable for reasons of status, but not really that important to the administration of the library, whereas getting information about new or changed courses and programs is. Urging the establishment of an ex officio slot for a librarian on the curriculum committee may be, then, not only the more expedient course, but actually the more desirable one.

These comments are related to Carol Juth-Gavasso's opinion that "the reference librarian, or the librarian involved in bibliographic instruction," rather than the library director, should be the ones most intimately involved with the faculty in collection development. The librarian, she feels, is first of all in too political a position and secondly, is "too far removed from daily interaction at the reference desk." While I strongly approve of her support of the reference librarian's role, I think she goes a bit far. Perhaps the reference or bibliographic instruction librarian does have the

best sense of what students are reading for their assignments and term papers, but while that is surely important information to guide purchasing, it still leads more or less to an immediate response. On the other hand, librarians who have been admired for their talent in building collections have anticipated the needs of students and faculty, and that capability is based on much more than reference service, no matter how good it may be. There is no substitute, I'm convinced, for knowing one's constituencies, being aware of institutional directions and of trends in higher education, and keeping all that in mind as one reads reviews and goes through catalogs. In a small library, the director, who should be aware of student needs as well, can do this; in larger libraries, the director must assign this to acquisitions librarians, or, as Ron Leach mentions in his paper, to bibliographers. Certainly those librarians who work closely with students should be involved in the process, and so it is -- as it should be -- a cooperative process, with each staff member contributing his or her special expertise -- on subject matter, on the content of existing or forthcoming courses and programs, on present or anticipated needs of students and faculty. All these contributions have their own imperatives and importances, which will vary in degree with the particular time or situation, and it is only by their orchestration, their working together, that the collection can be built most efficiently and effectively.

REFERENCE

1. F. W. Lancaster, Laura Drasgow and Ellen Marks. "The Changing Face of the Library: A Look at Libraries and Librarians in the Year 2001. "Collection Management 3 (Spring, 1979): 55-77.